

**Reauthorization Subcommittee Meeting
Draft Meeting Minutes
World Class Conference Room, Kilroy Building, Sea Tac
June 1, 2006, 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.**

Initial if

Present	Name	Organization	Phone	e-mail
<i>Subcommittee Members</i>				
RSE	Rodney Eng (Lead)	City of Seattle	206-684-8241	rodney.eng.@seattle.gov
DRA	Dan Absher	Absher Construction	253-845-9544	dra@abshernw.com
Absent	Butch Reifert	Design Industry	206-441-4151	breifert@mahlum.com
Absent	Rocky Sharp	Electrical Contractor	253-383-4546	rsharp@madsenelectric.com
Absent	Ed Kommers	Mechanical Contractors	206-612-7304	ekommers@comcast.net
Absent	Dave Johnson	WA State Bldg. & Construction Trades Council	360-357-6778	DJIW86@aol.com
JP	John Palewicz	UW	206-221-4223	palewicz@u.washington.edu
JL	John Lynch	General Administration	360-902-7227	jlynch@ga.wa.gov
Absent	Wendy Keller	Public Hospital Project Review Board	206-684-1912	Wendy.Keller@metrokc.gov
Absent	Tom Peterson	Hoffman Construction	206-286-8697	tom-peterson@hoffmancorp.com
Absent	Ashley Probart	Assoc of WA Cities	360-753-4137	ashleyp@awcnet.org
DL	Dick Lutz	Centennial Contractors	360-867-9443	dicklutz@comcast.net
LS	Larry Stevens	NECA/MCA	253-212-1536	lwstevens@wwbd.org
PB	Paul Berry	Former City of Seattle Employee	206-772-1772	pnberry1@earthlink.net
Absent	Steve Goldblatt	University of Washington	206-685-1676	bconbear@u.washington.edu
SB	Stan Bowman	AIA WA Council	360-943-6012	bowman@aiawa.org
Absent	G.S. "Duke" Schaub	Associated General Contractors	360-352-5000	dschaub@agcwa.gov
<i>Other Attendees</i>				
Absent	Michael Mequet	Port of Seattle	(206) 835-7632	Mequet.m@portseattle.org
ND	Nancy Deakins	General Administration	360-902-8161	deakink@dshs.wa.gov
Absent	Lyle Martin	Hoffman Construction	206-286-6697	Lyle-martin@hoffmancorp.com
DG	Dick Goldsmith	AWPHD	206-216-2528	richardg@awphd.org
MT	Michael Transue	AGC	253-223-2508	Cmjtransue@comcast.net
Absent	Dan Vaught	School District Project Review Board	425-489-6447	dvaught@nsd.org
GE	Ginger Eagle	WA Public Ports Assoc.	360-943-0760	geagle@washingtonports.org
CH	Chris Hirst	Preston Gates & Ellis	206-370-8336	chirst@prestongates.com
MR	Marsha Reilly	House of Reps	360-786-7135	Reilly.marsha@leg.wa.gov

KL	Kathryn Leathers	House of Reps	360-786-7114	Leathers.kathryn@leg.wa.gov
DS	Diane Smith	Senate Gov Ops	360-786-7410	Smith.diane@leg.wa.gov
NH	Nora Huey	King County	206-684-2049	Nora.huey@metrokc.gov
Absent	Mike Grace	Groff Murphy	206-628-9500	mgrace@groffmurphy.com

Task Force #2 (MACC) Report

Lead: John Palewicz

Received a two page handout. There are four issues on the front page of the handout. The task force met one week ago. We added and subtracted from it.

Rodney stated that Issue 4, 5a (Page 2 of handout) was vetoed by the Governor very carefully. This issue was brought to Task Force #2 and they should not get bogged down in this. A senator said this issue will be back in the legislature next session. Hope we can move forward on these issues.

Motion 1 regarding Issue 1: There will be wordsmithing completed by legislative staff, recommend modifications; it was seconded and all agreed.

Motion 2 regarding Issue 4: There will be wordsmithing completed by legislative staff, put in only and changing sentence at end of 5a, it was seconded, delete “intent to.” Also, subcontractors have questions on the word “may.”

Rodney said that Task Force #1 (Owner) will come up with if they have a recommendation regarding rule making power, composition and quorum of the Board). As we move forward, many issues will surface. It would be a Board like CPARB (slightly modified) would be a rule making authority. Bulk of review work done by a subcommittee(s) designated and established by CPARB. Will there be too high a level of detail? Before you get there, is not good. It removes authority group from being in full function.

John thinks the above suggestion might work well. We should grant CPARB rule making authority when activities and/or language changes, needs can be adjusted.

Rodney stated that rule making authority is an issue. CPARB just advises right now. It doesn't have real powers.

Michael said that we should be careful about increasing fiscal note on this. Don't create a fiscal animal that is costly to operate. If we establish a board and given it membership we have to be carefully about delegating down.

Task Force #1 (Owner) Report

Lead: Stan Bowman

Stan stated that the Board could have a representative from each of the industries and one alternative for each representative, in case someone couldn't make it to the meeting. The alternate would attend for them.

Michael said he would prefer a subcommittee approach and think it would work well. He agrees for the Public Hospital Districts. Suggested that we get an attorney to help Task Force #1 flesh this out.

Stan asked where do you draw the line for what kind of subcommittees and different projects – can end up with 20 different subcommittees. We will need to set up subcommittees, example:

- 1 Local Governments
- 1 Ports
- 1 Hospitals
- 1 Schools
- 1 Universities and Colleges

Michael said it is more at a level of interest. Different subcommittees are good, and then no one has to go the same group of board members every time.

CPARB (political) vs. Project Review Board (practical) should be separate. It is a different skill set.

Submittals

Are they going to come to Seattle or Olympia just to submit a project? Some may already have authority of their own.

Rule making authority will cause more cost impacts.

It was mentioned that CPARB should establish as many boards as necessary and not put a limit on it.

Rodney stated that some are clearly in conflict.

Stan said that he is in support for multiple review committees, based on broad allocation types.

Rodney is still concerned with consistency.

Stan said a core group could appoint, then for specific projects, specific members would be appointed. Chris asked would that address the issue.

Dick stated that consistency - criteria is important. This will help any review board.

Rodney said it is a challenge.

Michael said that accessibility is an issue (big project and small group of members). Should be given fair consideration by individuals interested in the project. Concerns of being lost in the shuffle.

Hospital Review and School Review Boards

Just meets in Olympia. Have members that understand Infection Control Systems and rural areas, etc...They have some flexibility. Wendy Keller has learned a lot about urban and rural hospital communities. They have presentations and the board talks with the applicants. The interaction is really good. The presentation will usually last fifteen to twenty minutes. The School Review Board is a similar model to the Hospital Review Board.

Stan stated for existing authority, could make applications in writing. Needs to be place for public comment from the general public.

It was stated that we are substituting this for the formal hearing (having a review board), a centralized place and in a centralized way.

Legislative staff commented that the Hospital Review Board has a limit of ten projects (\$5 – 10 million) and the School Review Board (there is competition), might have bearing on how a new board would operate.

Task Force #3 (Contractor) Report

Lead: Ed Kommers (Rodney gave the report since Ed was unavailable)

Nothing to give to subcommittee or CPARB at this time. However, next month could have a major package ready from this task force.

John Lynch said that we need to get revisions in for 39.10 and realize there are still open issues.

Rodney stated that we have to agree on the entire package. June and July are a fairly critical time for us. In July, we should be ready. August is the magic date for seeing the entire package. We should get the entire draft done and see the whole picture. This is a great topic for CPARB Meeting on June 8th, so we can see where the whole picture is and look for the holes in it.

Meetings Reminder

- June 22nd, Task Force #1 (Owner), 10:00 a.m., Olympia, Location to be Determined
- July 6th, Reauthorization Subcommittee, 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.
- July 7th, Expansion Subcommittee, 9:00 – 11:00 a.m.

John Palewicz said that the Task Force #2 (MACC) is done with their work.

Meeting Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.